

Remarks/Arguments

Applicant thanks the Examiner for her careful consideration of their application and for the helpful interview of July 19, 2005. Applicant requests entry of the above amendments and requests reconsideration of this application in view of those amendments and in view of the remarks to follow.

Claims 2-8, 10-26, and 38 are now pending in the application, with Claim 18 being the sole remaining independent claim. Claims 1, 9, and 27-37 have been cancelled, either by the above amendment or by previous amendment, without prejudice to pursue their subject matter in one or more subsequent applications.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

The Office Action, at pages 2-11, rejects Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11, 13-20, 22-25, 33, 36, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al.; Claims 5, 12, 21, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. in view of Schnarel et al.; and Claims 10, 28-32, 34, 35, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. in view of Haserodt. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of Claims 9 and 27-37 are rendered moot by their cancellation. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the remaining claims in view of the amendments above.

In particular, Claim 18 has been amended to include the limitations of (now-cancelled) Claim 9. All other remaining claims now (Claims 2-8, 10-17, 19-26, and 38) depend either

directly or indirectly from Claim 18. Claim 18 recites that "the graphical user interface comprises a first icon to access a network site of an organization and a second icon to dial *the* telephone number of the organization using at least one of the telephone features." (Emphasis added.) By changing the word "a" to "the" in Claim 18, Applicant submits that the claim is now clear in that the telephone number being referred to is the telephone number of the organization whose network site is referred to in connection with the first icon. In contrast, as discussed in Applicant's previous Amendment and Reply (filed July 9, 2004), Wood et al., at col. 9, lines 3-13, discusses the access and use of a national directory by clicking on a button and possibly dialing a phone number from the directory by selecting it and clicking on another ("DIAL") button. Hence, in Wood et al., one goes to a web site of one organization (a national directory) and uses it to obtain a phone number for a different organization. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 18 and the claims that depend therefrom are allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants respectfully state that their amendments are not to be understood as indicating concurrence with the characterizations of the claims and/or the prior art found in the Office Action.

Applicant: SLAVIN
Appl. No. 09/715,068

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and objections and that they be withdrawn.

Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

July 21, 2005


Jeffrey W. Gluck, Ph.D.

Registration No. 44,457

VENABLE LLP

P.O. Box 34385

Washington, D.C. 20043-9998

Telephone: (202) 344-4000

Direct Dial: (202) 344-8017

Telefax: (202) 344-8300